



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,314	06/12/2006	Stefan Eichholz	07130.0003.PCUS00	8112
22930	7590	07/27/2007	EXAMINER	
HOWREY LLP			LYJAK, LORI LYNN	
C/O IP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2941 FAIRVIEW PARK DR, SUITE 200				
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042-2924			3612	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/27/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/541,314	EICHHOLZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lori L. Lyjak	3612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 4-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 June 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 4-11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only and/or cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 4-11 not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. **Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DE 101 59 390:**

Regarding claim 1, German reference '390 discloses a cabriolet motor vehicle with a roof having at least two moving units that are fastened to the chassis on main bearings so they can move and which have at least one rigid roof part assigned to them, characterized by the fact that at least one rear part of the rigid roof, including a rear window, is connected to a main bearing by a multi-link chain, wherein at least one part of the link chain sets that part of the rigid roof in motion in relation to the main bearing and at least one part of the link chain changes the angular adjustment of that part of the rigid roof.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 101 59 390 in view of EP 1 074 415.

Regarding claim 2, German reference '390 discloses the cabriolet vehicle but does not show the link chain is two-piece, and the parts can be made to move by at least one coupling rod by the movement of a moving unit for at least one other rigid roof part.

European reference '415 teaches a link chain is two-piece, and the parts can be made to move by at least one coupling rod by the movement of a moving unit for at least one other rigid roof part.

Regarding claim 2, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the cabriolet vehicle of German reference '390 with a link chain is two-piece, and the parts can be made to move by at least one coupling rod by the movement of a moving unit for at least one other rigid roof part, as taught by European '415, in order to move the roof.

Regarding claim 3, German reference '390 discloses the cabriolet vehicle but does not show each part of the link chain is in a working connection with the moving unit for at least one other rigid roof part via a coupling rod.

European reference '415 teaches each part of the link chain is in a working connection with the moving unit for at least one other rigid part via a coupling rod.

Regarding claim 3, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the cabriolet vehicle of German reference '390 with

each part of the link chain is in a working connection with the moving unit for at least one other rigid via a coupling rod, as taught by European reference '415, in order to move the roof.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The cited references show several other cabriolet vehicles similar to that of the current invention.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lori L. Lyjak whose telephone number is 571-272-6658.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Dayoan can be reached on 571-272-6659. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lori L. Lyjak/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3612

III
July 16, 2007